

**Remarks/Arguments:**

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed December 22, 2003. The fee for addition of new claims is included herewith.

Claims 1-4 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, solely as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. The present Response adds new claims 5-12, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1-12. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

Claims 1 and 2 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Brown et al., U.S. Patent 5,887,133. Claims 2 and 4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown et al., U.S. Patent 5,887,133.

New claims 5-12 have been added. As suggested by the Examiner in paragraph 6 of the Office Action, these claims include the limitation that not all of the contents are displayed in the new rendition. Claims 5-8 cover new renditions for personal digital assistants (PDAs). Claims 9-12, cover new renditions for phones.

These new limitations are not shown or suggested in the Brown reference. Additionally, no reformatting for a different class of devices is done in Brown. For these reasons, claims 5-12 are believed to be allowable and such is respectfully requested.

The originally presented claims 1-4 are additionally believed to be allowable.

Brown describes a system in which a portion of a document, such as an advertisement on a web page can be selected. This portion of the document can be replaced by a message or advertisement that roughly fits into the removed section. This is significantly different than claims 1 and 3 of the present invention. Claims 1 and 3 indicate that the new rendition includes an identified section. In the Brown references the opposite occurs. An identified section is removed from the new rendition in the system of the Brown reference. The Brown reference does not describe selecting the elements which are to be included in the new display. For this reason, claims 1 and 3 are believed to be allowable.

Additionally, the reformatting of the Brown reference is not to be believed to be done with respect or characteristic of a specific character class of devices. The original and revised documents in the Brown reference are both formatted for a computer monitor or TV set. Thus, no reformatting needs to be done based upon the character of a specific class of devices. For this additional reason claims 1 and 3 are believed to be allowable. Claims 2 and 4 are believed to be allowable because they are dependent upon independent claims 1 and 3.


The references cited by the Examiner but not relied upon have been reviewed, but are not believed to render the claims unpatentable, either singly or in combination.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3/22/04

By:   
Joseph P. O'Malley  
Reg. No. 36,226

FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-4156  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800